General Education Curriculum Committee  
Minutes  
October 2, 2014

Present: Keith Moreland, Shan Parker, Cameron McLeman, Elizabeth Collardey, Sarah Lippert, Kyle Manley, Hisyar Ozsoy (for Stephanie Dean-CAS Curriculum Committee), Jie Li (SOM Curriculum Committee representative)

1. Additions to the agenda
   a. Lippert inquired about ARH321 which was submitted last year. Moreland will follow-up and check with S. Alberto.
2. Review of September 18, 2014 minutes.
   a. Minutes approved
3. No new GE courses to review.
4. No non-equivalent courses to review.
5. Discussion held about GELO Assessment Participation reports submitted by Barnes.
   a. Parker inquired on behalf of SHHPS’ Curriculum Committee, what are GenEd Assessment outcomes? Barnes has not yet shared reports such as the Participation reports distributed to GECC members.
   b. Lippert stated: How the university will respond to assessment data will be looked at by HLC. The Academic Assessment Committee began to discuss implications of GenEd Participation.
   c. Further GECC discussion uncovered:
      i. Last year, Barnes reported a perception among faculty that GenEd Assessment was either required or not required.
      ii. Lippert posed: Is the fact that faculty could enter assessment data after the deadline be helpful or not? Many faculty have time limitations at the end of a semester.
      iii. Has GECC ever met with the Assessment Committee?
      iv. GECC hasn’t addressed assessment of GELO much in the past.
      v. Feedback to the academic units would be helpful/beneficial.
   d. Keith posed a question for Barnes: We’re collecting a lot of data. What are we doing with the data?
   e. Lippert recommended that future professional development workshops on how to improve GELO outcomes might be beneficial for faculty.
   f. GECC members agreed that the question of “are we achieving GELOs?” is more meaningful than knowing the rates of faculty participation. GECC would like to place this item on the next GECC meeting agenda and to include a discussion of what GECC’s role might be in GenEd assessment.
   a. Parker reported for SHHPS:
      i. MTA is not an issue.
      ii. SHHPS will vote on MTA at October 17th meeting if there are no further questions.
   b. Lippert reported on recent CAS Curriculum Committee meeting:
      i. Debate continues over faculty accepting or not accepting MTA.
ii. Specific to ENG112 is the conflict of making it a pre-requisite versus not giving it a GenEd designation.

iii. CAS is considering adjusting CAS requirements.

iv. CAS course names have the same “names” as MTA but content-wise, they are not the same courses.

v. MTA will be an item at the open CAS meeting in October.

vi. There may be another forum on MTA.

vii. A vote may possibly occur in December.

c. Jie Li reported for SOM’s Curriculum Committee:
   i. MTA is on the October agenda for the governing faculty.

d. Collardey reported for SEHS’s Curriculum Committee:
   i. MTA is on the October agenda for the governing faculty.

e. Ozsoy’s question: What negotiation power do we (i.e, faculty) have regarding MTA? Lippert responded that Faculty Council’s position is: we do have authority to make adjustments in the MTA’s implementation.

7. Matters arising: None

8. Meeting adjourned at 1:45pm.

Next meeting: Thursday, October 16\textsuperscript{th}, 12:45-2:15pm, #3124 White Building.

Respectfully Submitted by your Humble Note Taker,
Elizabeth K. Collardey